

REMARKS

Election/Restrictions in the Office Action

The Office Action of Aug. 28, 2006, in page 2 interpreted the application as containing claims directed to the following patenably distinct species:

Species of Fig. 3;

Species of Fig. 4;

Species of Fig. 5; and

Species of Fig. 6.

The Office Action asserted that the inventions as claimed are not obvious variant and are not capable of use together because each test circuit behaves and functions distinctly.

Reply to the election/restrictions

Applicant groups the pending claims with respect to the species as set forth below:

Species of Figs. 3A, 3B and 3C reads on claims 1, 2, and 10-12.

Species of Fig. 4 reads on claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-12, 15, 16, and 19.

Species of Fig. 5 reads on claims 1-4, and 10-14.

Species of Fig. 6 reads on all claims 1-19.

Applicant provisionally elect/restricts the species of Fig. 6, which as shown above reads on all pending claims. Further, claims 1, 2, and 10-12 are generic to all species.


CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that election/restriction requirement has been satisfied without

traverse. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500